[28th January 1956

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : There is a *prima facie* case. That is why the matter is under examination.

Bonus for textile mill workers in Coimbatore district

* 3077 *Q.*—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that an Arbitration Board has been constituted under the Chairmanship of Sri N. S. Arunachalam, Secretary, Industries, Labour and Co-operation Department, during October 1955 to decide the bonus issue of the Textile Mill Workers of 22 mills in Coimbatore for the year 1954; and

(*b*) whether the Board has conducted any enquiry?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (*a*) Yes, Sir.

(*b*) The Board heard the parties to the dispute. The Chairman gave his award on 28th October 1955.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : கோயம்புத்தூரிலுள்ள ஒரு மில்லில் ஒவ்வொரு வருஷமும் அதிகப்படியான லாபம் வந்தபோதிலும், ஒரே விதமான போனஸ் அளிக்கப்பட்டது. அதாவது 1953-ம் வருஷத்தில் நான்கு மாத போனஸ் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. 1954-ம் வருஷத்தில் 17 லட்ச ரூபாய் லாபம் வந்தும் நான்கு மாத போனஸ்தான் அளிக்கப்பட்டது. 1955-ம் வருஷத்தில் 24 லட்சம் ரூபாய் லாபம் வந்தும் நான்கு மாத போனஸ்தான் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. ஆகையால் லாபத்தைப் பொருத்து போனஸ் கொடுக்கப்படுகிறதா அல்லது வேறு எந்த அடிப்படையில் இந்த போனஸை நிர்ணயிக்கிறார்கள் என்று அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : கோயம்புத்தூர் மில்லில் உள்ள தொழிலாளர்களும், முதலாளிகளும் எல்லோருமாக சேர்ந்து ஒப்புக்கொண்டு மத்தியஸ்தர் போர்டுபடி ஏகமனதாக தீர்மானம் நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதன்படிதான் லாபம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது.

MR. SPEAKER : Question time is over.

III.—STATEMENT UNDER RULE 40 *RE* LATHI CHARGE, ETC., IN SALEM, MADURAI, MADRAS, KASARGODE AND TIRUCIRRAPPALLI.

10-10 a.m. MR. SPEAKER : Notice has been received of the folowing :—

"Sri C. Kandasamy will call attention of the Hon. Minister for Finance to a matter of urgent public importance, viz., lathi charge, etc., in Salem, Madurai, Madras, Kasargode and Tiruchirappalli agains common people for agitating and demonstrating peacefully for a just and democratic adjustment of boundaries and against the proposal to form a Southern State."

SRI C. KANDASAMY : கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த பிரேரணையை கொண்டு வந்ததின் நோக்கம், இன்றைய தினம் ராஜ்யம் பூராவும் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் குழப்பமும் கொந்தளிப்பும் இந்நாட்டு மக்களுக்கு மிகுந்த வேதனையாக இருக்கிறபடியால் இதை சர்க்காரின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர நினைக்கிறேன். ராஜ்ய சீரமைப்பு கமிஷன் ரிபோர்ட்டின் பேரில் மத்திய சர்க்கார் அறிவித்ததின்பேரில் இன்றைய தினம் நாட்டில் இந்த விதமான கொந்தளிப்பு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்பதை

28th January 1956] [Sri C. Kandasamy]

குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். அதற்காக இந்த சர்க்கார் என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க யோசிப்பதாக இருக்கிறது என்று அறிய விரும்புகிறேன். முக்கியமாக தேவிகுளம், பீர்மேடு பிரதேசங்கள் தமிழ் நாட்டுடன் சேர்க்கப்படாது என்று அறிவித்ததினால் தான் இவ்விதமாக மக்களுக்கு மக்கள் பலவிதமான அபிப்பிராய பேதங்கள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இந்த சூழ்நிலை ஏற்படுவதற்கு யார் காரணம் என்று அறிய விரும்புகிறேன். இந்நாட்டில் இன்றைய தினம் கொந்தளிப்பும் குழப்பமும் அராஜகமும் நிலவுவது சந்தோஷப்படக்கூடியதாக இல்லை. இந்த பகுதியிலுள்ள மக்களை பெரிதும் குமுறிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இது ஜனநாயக பண்பிற்கே புறம்பானது. இந்தத் தீர்ப்பினால் மத்திய சர்க்கார் மக்களுக்கு பெருத்த அநீதியை விளைவித்து விட்டார்கள் என்பது எங்களின் ஒட்டு மொத்தமான அபிப்பிராயம் என்று சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த பிரச்னையின் சம்பந்தமாக சில மந்திரிகள் பல இடங்களில் பேசியிருப்பதானது இப்பொழுது இந்நாட்டில் நிலவி வரும் குழப்பத்தை இன்னும் அதிகரிக்கச் செய்வதாக இருக்கிறது. மக்களுடைய முக்கியமான அபிலாஷையாக இருக்கும் இப் பிரச்னையைப்பற்றி மந்திரிகள் ஏதாவது பேசிக்கொண்டே போனால், மக்களிடையே நிச்சயமாக இன்னும் அதிக குழப்பமும், கொந்தளிப்பும் விளையும் என்று தெரிவிக்க விரும்புகிறேன். இன்னும் சிற்சில இடங்களில் கிளம்பிய குழப்பத்தை அடக்குவதற்காக "லத்தி சார்ஜ்"-ம் நடந்திருப்பதாகத் தெரிகிறது. ஜனநாயக பண்பிற்கே இவ்விதமான செயல்கள் புறம்பானது என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு, கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் இந்நாட்டு மக்களிடையே குமுறிவரும் பிரச்னையைத் தீர்ப்பதற்கு எந்த விதமான நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துள்ளார்கள் என்று அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Mr. Speaker, I am really happy that the hon. Member Sri Kandasamy has categorically stated at least now that the decision with regard to Devikulam and Peermede is an injustice. As a matter of fact, when this matter came up before the Assembly for vote, the Communist party remained neutral. I am not surprised at their attitude, because they will always take advantage of the troubled conditions (Applause from Congress benches) and try to fish in throubled waters. Whose expectations are being shattered now, I am sure, the hon. Member will be able to understand.

As far as the motion under rule 40 is concerned, the hon. Member has very cleverly included one clause towards the end of the motion saying 'and against the proposal to form a Southern State'. As far as the present agitation is concerned, the question of the formation of a Southern State did not come into the picture at all at this stage. The entire agitation at the present time centred Devikulam and Peermede. Sir, I wish to take this opportunity to make the position clear. It is not as if that only the hon. Members on the other side are disappointed at the decision with regard to Devikulam and Peermede. We also put forward our case as strongly as possible and we are also disappointed that we did not get Devikulam and Peermede for ourselves. But, this is a different question altogether. Even when this matter was under discussion before the Assembly, I stated we were bound to put forward our case to the best of our ability, but we cannot be judges of our own case. We have to abide by the decision of third parties. If we do not have confidence in Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and in his leadership, that is quite different altogether. You can put it in another form. It is not as if these

third parties, Sri Jawaharlal Nehru and others, have a partiality towards the Malayalees and so they have given a decision in favour of the Malayalees. In spite of the fact that we feel that justice has not been done to us, whenever there is a dispute and whenever it is not possible to come to a mutual agreement, we have to abide by third party decisions.

10 20 a.m. Therefore to say that it is an undemocratic decision is only aggravating the situation and trying to add fuel to the fire. After all, these things should be left to disinterested third parties to give a decision when there is no agreement as between ourselves. That being so, I do not see the need for any agitation. As far as I am concerned I am prepared to say that no agitation is going to help us. So far as the Government side is concerned, we have again tried to impress upon the Government of India the necessity for the inclusion of Peermede and Devikulam in the Madras State not because of the agitation that is being carried on, but because of the justness of the case. Ultimately if we are not able to come to an agreement with the Travancore-Cochin Government we will have to necessarily depend upon arbitration and whatever be the decision of the arbitration we will have to abide by it. It is not good to accept the decision only when it is in our favour and revolt or protest against it when it is not in our favour. There can then be no question of arbitration. It is not only one side alone that is concerned with it. This protest and this agitation is open to the other party also to carry on when the decision is not in its favour. Therefore there should be a final decision at some point. We cannot go on agitating for it. For example, if a person dear to us dies, no doubt, we are shocked, we give vent to our feelings. But as wisemen after some time we feel that it is inevitable and try to carry on with the normal activities to the best of our ability in spite of the loss that we have suffered. It is a foolish thing to go on bemoaning and thinking of the loss we have suffered. As in the case of the private individual, even so in the case of States, we should carry on our normal activities. It is not as if we have lost something which formed part of our State. We claimed a territory which formed part of another State. A decision has been given in respect of this claim. Therefore I would respectfully appeal to the hon. Members of this House and to the general public not to get unnecessarily agitated over this issue because this decision will not take away the territory to any foreign country. We should keep in mind the fact that we still continue to be a united India and whatever decisions are taken, they are taken only for the purpose of administrative convenience. Whatever be the ultimate demarcation of the boundary and however well it is done, whatever be the unit taken for the purpose of demarcation, I have no doubt we will ultimately find that there would be linguistic minorities in every State, after any demarcation we may attempt. Therefore the only way to carry on peacefully is to see that these linguistic minorities are enabled to carry on their activities, their fundamental rights are guaranteed and their

28th January 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

lives are made as comfortable and as convenient as possible in the other State also. For that purpose there is sufficient provision in the Constitution and further provisions will be made for the purpose of safeguarding the linguistic minorities living in the various States.

Therefore, I am afraid, we are taking a wrong view of the entire matter and trying to carry on agitation. One distressing feature in this picture as far as I am concerned is dragging the students into it. No doubt, when we were fighting a foreign Government, foreign domination, and when we wanted to gain freedom for our country, we used the students for that purpose. That itself has caused sufficient havoc. That itself has caused a good deal of indiscipline in the student world. Therefore, we will have to take into account this aspect and consider whether it will be good to carry on in that atmosphere even now, even in a free India which would not only affect the present India but affect the future India also. Therefore I would appeal to the public and also to the political parties who are interested in this to see that the students are not dragged into the picture and that too young children, ignorant children. I say ignorant because when a question was put to a young student 12 years old, as to why he was agitating on this he at once said : ' Peelamede in Coimbatore district has been transferred to the Kerala State. How can we tolerate it? '. Another said : ' Devikulam water should be used for Devikulam only, that " Kulam " should be made common and water from there should be divided to Tamil Nad also.' That is the understanding on which the agitation has been carried on, by the young pupils. Whatever be the understanding, even if they understand the position all right, it is a dangerous principle to involve them in this political agitation. They won't be able to carry on with their studies. After all who are the students participating in this agitation? Students who are backward in the schools take advantage of the situation and they want to become heroes by going about in the streets shouting all sorts of slogans, marching to other institutions also and asking the students there also to come out. If this should go on in this way, it will affect our future generation much more than ourselves. After all mature persons can take part in the agitation. Therefore I would appeal particularly to those who are interested in the future of the country not to involve the students in this agitation.

With reference to the expression of dissatisfaction and discontent arising out of this decision, on behalf of the Government, I would like to congratulate the people of this State on the restrained way in which they have conducted themselves. No doubt there have been sporadic attempts here and there of stone-throwing or causing obstruction and all these things. But they were exceptional and few. On the whole, we have behaved well and I am glad about it. I would have been happier if the students had not been dragged into the picture.

The hon. Member referred to the action taken by the Police. So long as we function as a Government we must take action to maintain law and order. Whichever Government is in power, this Government or the Communist Government or any other, must maintain law and order. If a Communist Government had been in power, I know, what sort of action they would have taken on the agitation against the decision taken by that Government. But we are not doing so. We are a democratic Government. We believe in the freedom of expression of opinion. But when the border is crossed and illegal acts are committed, certainly the Police cannot remain merely as observers of these breaches of law and order. Therefore when stones were thrown or when cordons were formed around trains preventing the trains from moving, then certainly it was the duty of the Police to intervene and restore order. When a train does not move, who is put to trouble? It is not any foreigner or any other person. Persons travelling in the train, some of them travelling on urgent business and anxious to reach their destination as early as possible, they are in trouble. Therefore we have a duty to see that all these normal activities go on. If anybody were to put up any obstruction to these normal activities, then we will have to restore order there for the purpose of protecting the rights of other people. From that point of view, the action taken by the Police, instead of being criticised, I am sure, will have the wholehearted support of the entire public and the hon. Members of this House representing the public, because on the whole we are trying to restore law and order not for the benefit of any particular individual or any particular section of the people, but for the benefit of the public as a whole.

Therefore instead of carrying on this agitation, I would appeal to the hon. Members and also to persons who are interested in this to see that we carry on our business as efficiently as possible and also express our opinion as strongly as possible. After all we as Members representing the public will have an opportunity to discuss the decision and to express our opinion. Do the hon. Members think that any agitation carried on outside this House, either peacefully or violently, will have greater effect than the expression of opinion by this House in an effective way. Therefore when we have an opportunity to discuss it and put forward our points of view, there is no point in everybody taking the law into his own hands and trying to impress upon the Government that injustice has been done. I would therefore appeal to everybody to see that normalcy is restored and we carry on our activities to the best advantage possible.

One unfortunate result of all these incidents is that the people's mind has been diverted from the real problem, namely, the economic development of the country. It is really an unfortunate development but that development has taken place. We have to face it as bravely as possible and as best as possible. And that is what we are trying to do. Therefore instead of distracting the mind of the people and taking it away from the economic

28th January 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

development of the country, I am sure persons who are responsible would realise that it is better to leave these things to the Members of the Legislature representing public opinion and Government that is responsible to the legislature to take necessary action and to get these things redressed as far as possible through the Government and the Legislature and carry on their normal activities. That would be my appeal to them.

Once again, I would like to express, on behalf of the Government the appreciation of the general calm and restraint which we have shown in spite of our disappointment and discontent with reference to the decision given in regard to Peermede and Devikulam. That is all I have got to say, Sir, and I am sure hon. Members would bear these in mind and create an atmosphere outside also so that there would be calm and peace outside and these matters could be considered in a detached and calm atmosphere and proper decisions taken.

Sri C. KANDASAMY : கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சியைப் பற்றியும் சென்னை அரசியல் விஷயத்தைப் பற்றியும் பின்னால் ஒரு சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் விளக்கிச் சொல்லுகிறேன். நான் சொன்ன விஷயங்களை கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் தெரிந்தோ தெரியாமலோ திரித்திக் கூறியிருக்கிறார்கள். நான் ஒரு விஷயத்தை மட்டும் இப்பொழுது குறிப்பிடுகிறேன். ராஜ்ய புனரமைப்பு விஷயமாக தேவிகுளம், பீர்மேடு, கூடலூர், காஸர்கோட் இவைகளைப்பற்றி ஜனங்களின் மத்தியில் தீவிர அபிப்பிராய பேதம் நிலவி வருகிறது என்று தான் நான் சொன்னேன். இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் கம்யூனிஸ்டு கட்சியைப் பற்றி கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் கூறியதைப்பற்றி பின்னால் ஒரு சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் விளக்கிக் கூற நான் கடமைப் பட்டிருக்கிறேன்.

IV.—MOTION FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE OF A MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. Member, Mr. Uppi, has given notice of a motion under Rule 11 of the Assembly Rules for grant of leave of absence to Mr. K. M. Seethi Sahib. He will move it.

* Sri K. UPPI : Sir, I move—

"That, under Rule 11 of the Madras Assembly Rules, leave of absence be granted by this House to Sri K.M. Seethi Sahib, till 15th April 1956, from the date of his absence."

Mr. Seethi Sahib attended a committee meeting at Madras early in July last and immediately after he returned to his place, he was taken seriously ill. He is now convalescing and it is the opinion of doctors that he should not take part in public activities for another two or three months. Therefore, I would request the House to accept this motion unanimously.

Sri T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: I second the motion.

The Hon. Sri C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I support the motion. We are all sorry that ill-health has prevented Mr. Seethi Sahib from attending the meeting of the Assembly. We all hope